

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Plaintiff,

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON,

Case No. 2:17-cr-00057-JCM-CWH

ORDER

Defendant filed a response (ECF No. 24) on June 27, 2017, and the government filed a reply (ECF No. 26) on July 5, 2017.

In *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals found that “[b]efore a presumptively innocent defendant may be shackled, the court must make an individualized decision that a compelling government purpose would be served and that shackles are the least restrictive means for maintaining security and order in the courtroom.” *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez*, 859 F.3d 649, 661 (9th Cir. 2017). The court reasoned that this right “respects our foundational principle that defendants are innocent until proven guilty.” *Id.*

Defendant relied on *Sanchez-Gomez* in filing his “Notice of Assertion of Right to be Present in Court Unshackled.” (Notice (ECF No. 21).) As required by *Sanchez-Gomez*, the court will “decide whether the stated need for security outweighs the infringement on a defendant’s right.” *Id.* at 666. The court will announce its individualized determination regarding shackling either before or at the commencement of Defendant’s next court appearance. Further, the court will deny the government’s motion to strike Defendant’s notice. Requiring Defendant to file a motion to be presented in court unshackled would place the burden on a defendant to establish that he should not

1 be shackled and would effectively disregard an individual's constitutional "right to be free from
2 unwarranted restraints." *See id* at 660.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the government's Motion to Strike Defendant
4 Johnson's Notice of Assertion of Right to be Present in Court Unshackled (ECF No. 22) is
5 DENIED.

6
7 DATED: December 5, 2017

8
9 
10 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**
11 **United States Magistrate Judge**
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28